

by wealthy people, like electric cars and \$8,000 electric bicycles.

Then there are billions more in special subsidies and loans for the next generation of Solyndras.

The gravy train doesn't stop there. When the Biden administration proposed spending \$40 billion on public housing renovations, the senior Senator from New York urged them to double down and spend \$40 billion exclusively on his hometown—exclusively on his hometown. That is \$40 billion to a housing authority that is apparently well known for bribery and mismanagement simply because the Democratic leader requested it.

Meanwhile, in Speaker PELOSI's backyard of San Francisco, the elite trustees of a massive park and development project—oh, boy, they are licking their chops. The Speaker plans to set aside \$200 million of the spending spree for this park that is specifically not meant to receive taxpayer money, so they can focus on “environmental and social justice.”

The Democrats' spree would also tear down longstanding, bipartisan Hyde amendment protections so they can directly fund abortion providers like Planned Parenthood with taxpayer dollars. Today's left cannot miss an opportunity to send Planned Parenthood a new slush fund.

Then there is the Democrats' obsession with the so-called SALT cap. Even as our colleagues draft the biggest tax hikes in half a century, they cannot resist the concept of special tax cuts for high earners in blue States. They want to reintroduce the Federal tax subsidy for living in high-tax States. One outside analysis found that a 2-year repeal of the SALT cap would send more than—listen to this—more than \$300,000 to the average household in the top 0.1 percent of our country. The average household in the bottom 60 percent would get \$15. This isn't a joke; this is literally the SALT policy that Democrats want—300 grand for the richest folks on the coast and 15 bucks for normal families.

It is the same setup everywhere you look. Special interests who are connected to the Democratic Party would make out like bandits, and middle-class families, they will get the bill.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the

Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jia M. Cobb, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

#### JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have good news. This week, the U.S. Senate is going to consider five highly qualified Federal district court nominees. Before briefly speaking on their records, I want to make a few broad observations.

First, each of these nominations was recommended by the White House, by their home State Senators, or, in the case of the D.C. District Court, by District of Columbia Representative ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. I want to commend my colleagues—they did their job. They continued to identify and recommend nominees who have the experience and the temperament needed to serve on the Federal bench.

Second, these nominees represent an important cross-section of professional diversity. They have served as public defenders. They have also been prosecutors, civil rights attorneys, municipal lawyers, and even sitting judges.

Third, all five of these nominees received bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee. How about that, bipartisan support in the committee. That is a testament to their abilities, qualifications, and character. I thank my Republican colleagues who made that possible.

Finally, these nominees understand the limited role a judge plays in our judicial system. They have to be guided by evenhandedness, impartiality, and fidelity to the rule of law. We have seen that in their records. These records have been scrupulously reviewed by staff on both sides—Democrat, Republican, in addition to the White House, obviously. We have seen it in their testimony before the Judiciary Committee, and we have seen it in the broad support they had from the legal communities where they live.

Let me tell you a bit about each of them.

First is Jia Cobb, nominated to the District Court for the District of Columbia. Ms. Cobb has more than 15 years of experience as a trial litigator. She has tried more than 30 cases to verdict in both civil and criminal cases. This depth of experience is one of the reasons she was rated unanimously—unanimously—“well qualified” by the American Bar Association.

For nearly a decade, she has represented people seeking to uphold their rights when it comes to the Nation's housing, disability, and employment discrimination laws.

Critically, Ms. Cobb understands the distinction between being an advocate and a judge. As a judge on the District of D.C., she has promised to rule based

on the law and facts of the cases before her.

Next is Judge Karen Williams, nominated to the District of New Jersey. Like Ms. Cobb, Judge Williams was unanimously rated “well qualified” by the ABA. That is a testament to her integrity, temperament, and experience, which includes 12 years as a Federal magistrate judge and another two decades as a practicing litigator.

She has the strong support of both Senators from New Jersey, MENENDEZ and BOOKER, and many throughout the New Jersey legal community.

We will also be voting this week on the nomination of Patricia Giles to the Eastern District of Virginia. Ms. Giles has a deep understanding of the district which she has been nominated to serve. As a Federal prosecutor, she tried more than 20 cases to verdict, and prosecutors and defense counsel alike have praised her fairness and her tenacity.

Ms. Giles also received a unanimous “well qualified” rating from the American Bar Association and has the strong support of her Senators, WARNER and KAINE.

The Senate will consider Judge Michael Nachmanoff, nominated to the Eastern District of Virginia. He has served as a Federal magistrate judge since 2015, following an accomplished career as the district's appointed Federal defender.

Judge Nachmanoff also received a unanimous “well qualified” rating from the ABA. He has the strong support of both Virginia Senators. Like Ms. Giles, Judge Nachmanoff received praise from prosecutors and defense attorneys alike. It is a testament to his integrity and evenhandedness.

Finally, the Senate is going to consider Sarala Nagala, nominated to the District of Connecticut bench. Ms. Nagala is an accomplished Federal prosecutor. She has devoted her career to very serious cases involving human trafficking, child exploitation, identity theft, hate crimes, and fraud.

Like each of the nominees, she received a unanimous rating of “well qualified” from the ABA and has strong support from Senators BLUMENTHAL and MURPHY.

I ask all my colleagues to join me in supporting these five extremely high-qualified nominees. With their record, experience, and evenhanded approach, they will be ready on day one to serve in the critically important role of district court judge.

Finally, let me say that for many of these people, this decision to move forward and ask for appointment to the Federal judiciary carries with it status and admiration from many people—most people—but it also may mean some personal sacrifices. They are now going to be officially in public life, and that brings with it, as we all know, some burdens. They are willing to accept that and their families are willing to accept it as they continue to serve as Federal judges.

I hope my colleagues will join me in approving them. I hope it is done this week in a timely manner.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, Democrats continue to negotiate with each other on their reckless tax-and-spending spree. Democrats are currently working to lower the bill's top-line number in an effort to meet some of the demands of the few moderate Democrats who have reservations about unchecked government spending.

Now, you might think that lowering the top-line number would involve deciding what programs and spending to eliminate to bring the bill in at a lower cost. Well, not exactly. Yes, Democrats are reportedly eliminating some spending, but the word is that, under pressure from progressives, who are dead set against curtailing their plans for expanding government, Democrats are planning to keep a lot of their most expensive proposals, but simply shorten the funding window to make the costs of these programs seem lower.

Take Democrats' fantastically expensive child allowance. Democrats have every intention of turning their child allowance into a permanent government welfare program, but in order to bring the top-line number of their spending bill down, the word is that Democrats are now planning to officially extend the allowance for just 1 year.

This is, in fact, a budget gimmick on top of a budget gimmick, as Democrats were already attempting to disguise the true cost of the child allowance by officially extending it for just 4 of the 10 years in the bill's 10-year budget window.

They were never, of course, planning to eliminate the child allowance after 4 years, and they are certainly not planning to eliminate it now after 1 year, but by officially extending it for just a year in their tax-and-spending spree, they can manage to make the program look as if it will cost hundreds of billions of dollars less than it will actually cost.

And they are apparently repeating this strategy with a number of their other spending measures.

That paid leave program? Apparently, the White House has proposed a smaller version that would supposedly expire after 3 or 4 years.

Those childcare subsidies? Apparently, those may also now, ostensibly, expire.

The ObamaCare subsidies Democrats want to extend permanently? Well,

once again, it sounds like they are going to try shrinking the apparent cost with a short-term extension.

But, again, let's be very clear here. These short-term extensions and short-term programs are nothing more than a budget gimmick to disguise the true cost of the Democrats' plan. There isn't one program that I have named that Democrats don't fully intend to make permanent.

Don't believe me? Just ask the Congressional Progressive Caucus, which outlined the strategy the Democrats are currently adopting in a letter to Speaker PELOSI.

I quote from that letter:

If given a choice between legislating narrowly or broadly—

the caucus wrote—

—we strongly encourage you to choose the latter, and make robust investments over a shorter window . . . This will help make the case for our party's ability to govern, and establish a track record of success that will pave the way for a long-term extension of benefits.

So the plan is to make these programs permanent and to permanently and massively expand the size of government. Democrats hope to get Americans hooked on the government benefits they are offering while hiding the true costs of those benefits from the American people until it is too late.

Frankly, it is not a bad strategy if your aim is to permanently expand the size of government because the truth is it is pretty hard to eradicate even the most inefficient and ineffective Federal program once it has been put into place.

As Ronald Reagan used to say, the nearest thing to eternal life that we will ever see on this earth is a government program.

That, of course, is what the Democrats are counting on. They believe that, once they put these programs in place, no one from either party will be able to get rid of them.

What is less clear is how Democrats believe these programs are going to be funded in the long term, if, in fact, they have given any thought to that issue at all. I wouldn't be surprised if they haven't.

It is important to note that the short-term programs and program extensions in the Democrats' tax-and-spending spree will be paid for by 10 years of taxes. That is right. It will take 10 years of taxes and other revenue-raising measures to pay for programs that are scheduled to last as little as 1 year.

So what happens when Democrats want to extend that child allowance again next year or extend those childcare subsidies for the long term?

Well, that is a really good question, and one for which I would love to hear the Democrats' answer.

Are Democrats going to trot out more tax hikes to pay for extending the child allowance or making the childcare subsidies permanent? Or are they going to just suggest that we add

hundreds of billions—and eventually trillions—to our already dangerously large national debt? And, if they opt for tax hikes, just who is going to be facing those tax hikes?

The Democrats are eventually going to run out of money from millionaires and billionaires, and then they are going to start coming after the wallets of the middle class.

Of course, when I say that the programs in the Democrats' tax-and-spending spree will be paid for with 10 years of taxes, I mean that Democrats are claiming—claiming—that those programs will be paid for, because it is by no means clear that Democrats' tax hikes and revenue-raising measures will actually result in the revenue they are claiming.

Democrats, for example, are claiming that their proposal to increase IRS enforcement measures, including a new requirement that would allow the IRS to look into the details of Americans' spending, will allow them to collect \$700 billion in revenue; but the Congressional Budget Office hasn't confirmed that estimate, and there is substantial reason to doubt that Democrats will be able to collect anywhere even close to that amount even with a doubling of the IRS's budget, a massive expansion of a number of IRS employees, and a number of audits of everyday Americans.

Even if Democrats do manage to rake in every dollar they are claiming, the tax hikes and revenue raisers they are proposing would have long-term costs beyond the dollar amount of the tax hikes.

More than one of the Democrats' tax proposals would have a chilling effect on investment and economic growth, which would mean a less vibrant economy with fewer jobs and opportunities for American workers, and the IRS proposal I mentioned could put the details of Americans' ordinary bank activities into the hands of the IRS, an agency that we have seen repeatedly mishandle the taxpayer data it already has, as recently as earlier this year.

Democrats may be able to come up with a smaller top-line number by hiding the true costs of the government programs they are contemplating, but their "buy now and pay later or pay never" approach to government spending is going to have serious consequences for our economy and for the American people.

Unfortunately, by the time the full costs of Democrats' massive government expansion are felt, it may be too late to do much about it; and that, apparently, is what Democrats are counting on.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.